

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated March 3, 2004, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 15 are currently amended. No new matter has been added to this application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

The present invention is a method and system for mitigating false alarms in a tire pressure monitoring system for an automotive vehicle. Independent claims 1, 4, 8, and 15 are amended to clarify the patently distinct step in the second stage of the controller is generating a composite warning status. The composite warning status is a combination of a low pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status. The composite warning status may also include additional warning statuses. Furthermore, the patently distinct composite warning signal is distinctively set forth in each of the currently amended independent claims. Applicants maintain that the prior art does not teach or suggest qualifying a warning signal in a second stage of the controller. However, in light of the Examiner's reply in his Final Office Action, Applicants have amended each independent claim to include a composite warning status that is qualified in the second stage of the controller.

Applicants address the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1, 4, 8, and 15 below in light of the current amendment.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claims 1 and 4 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference. *Juzswik* states, "[A]t step 214, a determination is made as to whether the pressure value indicated by the signal portion of the message packet of the response signal is within the tire is within the predefined pressure range. If the determination at step 214 is affirmative, the process 200 proceeds to step 216. At step 216, the controller 36 outputs the in-range signal to the second indicator 50..." (col 7, lns 8-16, and Figure 2). *Juzswik* does not teach or suggest a method and system for mitigating false alarms in a tire pressure

monitoring system for an automotive vehicle. Moreover, *Juzswik* does not teach or suggest generating a composite warning status. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 are amended to clarify the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status provides an in-range signal when the pressure statuses have not exceeded the pressure threshold and the pressure transmitters are not in a fault condition. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner allow claims 1 and 4.

In the Final Office Action, claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165).

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claim 8 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference. Claim 8 is amended to include the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status is combination of a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 8. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* reference.

In the Final Office Action, claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165) in view of *Bezek et al.* (6,278,363). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully believe that the steps of the controller described in claim 15 are not taught or suggested in the *Juzswik* reference in view of the *Bezek* reference. Claim 15 is amended to include the warning status of the second stage of the controller is a composite. That is, the composite warning status is a combination of a low pressure warning status, a flat pressure warning status, a high pressure warning status, and a sensor status for each of the received pressure signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* in view of *Bezek* fail to teach or suggest every limitation of claim 15. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* or *Bezek* references.

Applicants further assert that dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are allowable for the reasons as set forth above in the currently amended independent claims. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this application in view of the comments above. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,  
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

R. Scott Vincent  
Reg. No. 55,771  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: June 3, 2004